arXiv:1510.01409v3 [math.AP] 20 Apr 2016

Multi-bump solutions for Choquard equation with deepening potential well

Claudianor O. Alves[a*], Alânnio B. Nóbrega[a†], Minbo Yang[b‡]

a. Universidade Federal de Campina Grande
Unidade Acadêmica de Matemática
CEP: 58429-900, Campina Grande - Pb, Brazil
b. Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Normal University
Jinhua, 321004, P. R. China.

Abstract

In this paper we study the existence of multi-bump solutions for the following Choquard equation

$$-\Delta u + (\lambda a(x)+1)u = \big(\frac{1}{|x|^{\mu}} * |u|^{p}\big)|u|^{p-2}u \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where $\mu \in (0,3), p \in (2, 6-\mu)$, λ is a positive parameter and the nonnegative continuous function $a(x)$ has a potential well $\Omega := int(a^{-1}(0))$ which possesses k disjoint bounded components $\Omega := \cup_{j=1}^{k}\Omega_j$. We prove that if the parameter λ is large enough, then the equation has at least $2^k - 1$ multi-bump solutions.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2010): 35J20, 35J65

Keywords: Choquard equation, multi-bump solution, variational methods.

1 Introduction

The nonlinear Choquard equation

$$-\Delta u + V(x)u = \Big(\frac{1}{|x|^{\mu}} * |u|^{p}\Big)|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^3, \tag{1.1}$$

$p = 2$ and $\mu = 1$, goes back to the description of the quantum theory of a polaron at rest by S. Pekar in 1954 [30] and the modeling of an electron trapped in its own hole in 1976 in the work of P. Choquard, as a certain approximation to Hartree-Fock theory of one-component plasma [20]. In some particular cases, this equation is also known as the Schrödinger-Newton equation, which was introduced by Penrose in his discussion on the selfgravitational collapse of a quantum mechanical wave function [31].

The existence and qualitative properties of solutions of (1.1) have been widely studied in the last decades. In [20], Lieb proved the existence and uniqueness, up to translations, of the ground state. Later, in [22], Lions showed the existence of a sequence of radially symmetric solutions. In [12, 25, 26] the authors showed the regularity, positivity and radial symmetry of the ground

*C. O. Alves was partially supported by CNPq/Brazil 301807/2013-2 and INCT-MAT, coalves@mat.ufcg.edu.br
†alannio@mat.ufcg.edu.br
‡M. Yang is the corresponding author, he was partially supported by NSFC (11571317, 11271331) and ZJNSF(LY15A010010), mbyang@zjnu.edu.cn

states and derived decay property at infinity as well. Moreover, Moroz and Van Schaftingen in [27] considered the existence of ground states under the assumptions of Berestycki-Lions type. When V is a continuous periodic function with $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^3} V(x) > 0$, noticing that the nonlocal term is invariant under translation, we can obtain easily the existence result by applying the Mountain Pass Theorem, see [3] for example. For periodic potential V that changes sign and 0 lies in the gap of the spectrum of the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta+V$, the problem is strongly indefinite, and the existence of solution for $p = 2$ was considered in [8] by reduction arguments. For a general case, Ackermann [3] proposed a new approach to prove the existence of infinitely many geometrically distinct weak solutions. For other related results, we refer the readers to [11, 18] for the existence of sign-changing solutions, [28, 34, 37] for the existence and concentration behavior of the semiclassical solutions and [29] for the critical nonlocal part with respect to the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality.

In the present paper, we are interested in the nonlinear Choquard equation with deepening potential well

$$-\Delta u + (\lambda a(x) + 1)u = \Big(\frac{1}{|x|^{\mu}} * |u|^p\Big)|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^3, \tag{C}_\lambda$$

where $\mu \in (0, 3), p \in (2, 6-\mu)$ and $a(x)$ is a nonnegative continuous function with $\Omega = int(a^{-1}(0))$ being a non-empty bounded open set with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. Moreover, Ω has k connected components, more precisely,

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} \Omega_j \tag{1.2}$$

with

$$dist(\Omega_i, \Omega_j) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i \neq j. \tag{1.3}$$

Moreover, we suppose that there exists $M_0 > 0$ such that

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3;\, a(x) \leq M_0\}| < +\infty. \tag{1.4}$$

Hereafter, if $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a mensurable set, $|A|$ denotes its Lebesgue's measure. The purpose of the present paper is to study the existence and the asymptotic shape of the solutions for $(C)_\lambda$ when λ is large enough, more precisely, we will show the existence of multi-bump type solutions.

The motivation of the present paper arises from the results for the local Schrödinger equations with deepening potential well

$$-\Delta u + (\lambda a(x) + b(x))u = |u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{1.5}$$

where $a(x), b(x)$ are suitable continuous functions and $p \in (2, \frac{2N}{N-2})$ if $N \geq 3$; $p \in (1, \infty)$ if $N = 1, 2$. In [5], for $b(x) = 1$, Bartsch and Wang proved the existence of a least energy solution for large λ and that the sequence of solutions converges strongly to a least energy solution for a problem in bounded domain. They also showed the existence of at least catΩ positive solutions for large λ, where $\Omega = int(a^{-1}(0))$, and the exponent p is close to the critical exponent. The same results were also established by Clapp and Ding [10] for critical growth case. We also refer to [6] for nonconstant $b(x) > 0$, where the authors prove the existence of k solutions that may change sign for any k and λ large enough. For other results related to Schrödinger equations with deepening potential well, we may refer the readers to [33, 32, 36]

The existence and characterization of the solutions for problem (1.5) with large parameter λ were considered in [1, 15], by supposing that $a(x)$ has a potential well $\Omega = int(a^{-1}(0))$ consisting of k disjoint bounded components $\Omega_1, \cdots, \Omega_k$, the authors studied the multiplicity and multi-bump shape of the solutions associated to the number of the components of the domain $\Omega = int(a^{-1}(0))$. In [15], by using of penalization ideas developed in [14], Ding and Tanaka were able to overcome

the loss of compactness and then they applied the deformation flow arguments found in [9, 35] to prove the existence at least $2^k - 1$ solutions u_λ for large values of λ. More precisely, for each non-empty subset Γ of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, it was proved that, for any sequence $\lambda_n \to \infty$ one can extract a subsequence (λ_{n_i}) such that $(u_{\lambda_{n_i}})$ converges strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to a function u, which satisfies $u = 0$ outside $\Omega_\Gamma = \bigcup_{j\in\Gamma} \Omega_j$ and $u_{|\Omega_j}$, $j \in \Gamma$, is a least energy solution for

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = |u|^{p-2}u, \text{ in } \Omega_j, \\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega_j),\ u > 0, \text{ in } \Omega_j. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

As we all know, the problem (1.6) on bounded domain plays an important role in the study of multi-bump shaped solutions for problem (1.5). By using of "gluing" techniques, Ding and Tanaka used the ground states of problem (1.6) as building bricks to construct minimax values and then proved the existence of multibump solutions by deformation flow arguments.

From the commentaries above, it is quite natural to ask if the results in [1, 15] still hold for the generalized Choquard equation. Unfortunately, we can not draw a similar conclusion in a straight way, since the nonlinearity of the generalized Choquard equation is a nonlocal one. For $\Gamma = \{1, \cdots, l\}$ with $l \le k$ and $\Omega_\Gamma = \bigcup_{j\in\Gamma} \Omega_j$, it is easy to see that

$$\int_{\Omega_\Gamma} \Big(\int_{\Omega_\Gamma} \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \Big) |u|^p dx \neq \sum_{i=1}^{l} \int_{\Omega_i} \Big(\int_{\Omega_i} \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \Big) |u|^p dx.$$

Thus, it is impossible to repeat the same arguments explored in [15] to use the least energy solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = \Big(\int_{\Omega_j} \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \Big) |u|^{p-2}u, \text{ in } \Omega_j, \\ u \neq 0, \text{ in } \Omega_j, \\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega_j), \quad j \in \Gamma, \end{cases} \tag{C}_j$$

for building the multi-bump solutions. For the generalized Choquard equation, it can be observed that the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = \Big(\int_{\Omega_\Gamma} \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \Big) |u|^{p-2}u, \text{ in } \Omega_\Gamma, \\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma), \end{cases} \tag{C}_{\infty,\Gamma}$$

plays the role of the limit problem for equation $(C)_\lambda$ as λ goes to infinity. Moreover, noticing that the solution may disappear on some component, for the Dirichlet problem of Choquard equation with components, it is not easy to prove the existence of the least energy solution that is nonzero on each component Ω_j, $j \in \Gamma$. In order to find this type of least energy solution we will study the minimizing problem on a subset of the Nehari manifold, see Section 2 for more details.

Here, we will also avoid the penalization arguments found in [14], because by using this method we are led to assume more restrictions on the constants μ and p. For that reason, instead of the penalization method, we will follow the approach explored by Alves and Nóbrega in [2], which showed the existence of multi-bump solution for problem (1.5) driven by the biharmonic operator. Thus, as in [2], we will work directly with the energy functional associated with $(C)_\lambda$, and we will modify in a different way the set of pathes where Deformation Lemma is used, see Sections 5 and 6 for more details.

To prove the existence of positive multi-bump solutions for $(C)_\lambda$, the first step is to consider the limit Dirichlet problem $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$ and to look for the existence of least energy solution that is nonzero on each component Ω_j, $j \in \Gamma$. Having this in mind, we proved the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $\mu \in (0,3)$ and $p \in [2, 6-\mu)$. Then problem $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$ possesses a least energy solution u that is nonzero on each component Ω_j of Ω_Γ, $j \in \Gamma$.*

Using the above theorem, we are able to state our main result.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\mu \in (0,3)$ and $p \in (2, 6-\mu)$. There exists a constant $\lambda_0 > 0$, such that for any non-empty subset $\Gamma \subset \{1, \cdots, k\}$ and $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, the problem $\big(C\big)_\lambda$ has a positive solution u_λ, which possesses the following property: For any sequence $\lambda_n \to \infty$ we can extract a subsequence (λ_{n_i}) such that $(u_{\lambda_{n_i}})$ converges strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to a function u, which satisfies $u = 0$ outside $\Omega_\Gamma = \bigcup_{j\in\Gamma} \Omega_j$, and $u_{|\Omega_\Gamma}$ is a least energy solution for $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$ in the sense of Theorem* 1.1.

Remark 1.3. *Noting that $(u_{\lambda_{n_i}})$ converges strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to a function u, which is zero outside Ω_Γ and nonzero on each component Ω_j, $j \in \Gamma$. In this way, we can conclude that the solutions (u_λ) have the shape of multi-bump if λ is large enough.*

Remark 1.4. *By the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, the natural interval for considering the Choquard equation is $(\frac{6-\mu}{3}, 6-\mu)$, however, the case $\frac{6-\mu}{3} < p \leq 2$ is not considered in Theorem* 1.2. *This is due to the fact that the method applied here do have some limitations in proving the intersection property for the pathes and the set $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma$ defined in Section 5. Inspired by a recent paper by Ghimenti, Moroz and Van Schaftingen [19], we will consider the case $p = 2$ in a future paper by approximation with $p \downarrow 2$.*

In order to apply variational methods to obtain the solutions for problems $(C)_\lambda$ and $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$, the following classical Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality will be frequently used.

Proposition 1.5. *[21] [$Hardy - Littlewood - Sobolev$ inequality]:*
Let $s, r > 1$ and $0 < \mu < 3$ with $1/s + \mu/3 + 1/r = 2$. Let $f \in L^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $h \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$. There exists a sharp constant $C(s, \mu, r)$, independent of f, h, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{f(x)h(y)}{|x-y|^\mu} dydx \leq C(s,\mu,r)|f|_s|h|_r.$$

In the sequel, we fix $E_\lambda = \big(E, \|\cdot\|_\lambda\big)$ where

$$E = \left\{ u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)\,;\, \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a(x)|u|^2 dx < \infty \right\},$$

and

$$\|u\|_\lambda = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla u|^2 + (\lambda a(x) + 1)|u|^2) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Obviously, E_λ is a Hilbert space, $E_\lambda \hookrightarrow H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ continuously for $\lambda \geq 0$ and E_λ is compactly embedded in $L^s_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, for all $1 \leq s < 6$. We will study the existence of solutions for problem $(C)_\lambda$ by looking for critical points of the energy functional $I_\lambda \colon E_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$I_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big(|\nabla u|^2 + \big(\lambda a(x) + 1\big)u^2\big)\, dx - \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u|^p\Big)|u|^p dx.$$

For $p \in (\frac{6-\mu}{3}, 6-\mu)$, the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality and the Sobolev embeddings imply that the functional $I_\lambda \in C^1(E_\lambda, \mathbb{R})$ with

$$I'_\lambda(u)v = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u \nabla v + (\lambda a(x) + 1)uvdx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u|^p\Big)|u|^{p-2}uvdx, \quad \forall u, v \in E_\lambda.$$

Hence, the critical points of I_λ are in fact the weak solutions for problem $(C)_\lambda$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we study a nonlocal problem set on bounded domain with 2 disjoint components for simplicity. By minimizing and deformation flow arguments, we are able to prove the existence of least energy solution which is nonzero on each component. In Section 3, we adapt the method used in [2] for the nonlocal situation, which permits us to prove that the energy functional satisfies the (PS) condition for λ large enough. In Section 4, we study the behavior of $(PS)_\infty$ sequence. In Section 5 and 6, we adapt the deformation flow method to establish the existence of a special critical point, which is crucial for showing the existence of multi-bump solutions for λ large enough.

2 The problem $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$

First, we need to study the Dirichlet problem $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$ with several components and investigate the existence of least energy solution that is nonzero on each component. The main idea is to prove that the energy functional associated to $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$ defined by

$$I_\Gamma(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_\Gamma}(|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2)dx - \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\Omega_\Gamma}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\Gamma}\frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|u|^p dx \tag{2.1}$$

achieves a minimum value on

$$\mathcal{M}_\Gamma = \{u \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma : I'_\Gamma(u)u_i = 0 \text{ and } u_i \neq 0,\ \ i \in \Gamma\}$$

where $\Gamma \subset \{1, \cdots, k\}$, $u_i = u|_{\Omega_i}$ and $\mathcal{N}_\Gamma$ is the Nehari manifold of I_Γ defined by

$$\mathcal{N}_\Gamma = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma) \setminus \{0\} \ : \ I'_\Gamma(u)u = 0\}.$$

More precisely, we will prove that there is $w \in \mathcal{M}_\Gamma$ such that

$$I_\Gamma(w) = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{M}_\Gamma} I_\Gamma(u) \quad \text{and} \quad I'_\Gamma(w) = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Hereafter, we say that $w \in H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma)$, satisfying $w_i = w|_{\Omega_i} \neq 0, i \in \Gamma$, is a least energy solution for $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$ if the above condition (2.2) holds. This feature will be used to characterize the multi-bump shape of the solutions of $(C)_\lambda$. Without loss of generality, we will only consider $\Gamma = \{1, 2\}$ for simplicity. Moreover, we denote by Ω, $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ the sets Ω_Γ, $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma$ and $\mathcal{N}_\Gamma$ respectively, and I_Γ will be denoted by I. Thereby,

$$\Omega = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2,$$

$$\mathcal{M} = \{u \in \mathcal{N} : I'(u)u_i = 0 \text{ and } u_i \neq 0,\ \ i = 1, 2.\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N} = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\} \ : \ I'(u)u = 0\}.$$

In what follows, we denote by $||\ ||$, $||\ ||_1$ and $||\ ||_2$ the norms in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, $H_0^1(\Omega_1)$ and $H_0^1(\Omega_2)$ given by

$$||u|| = \left(\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2)dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$||u||_1 = \left(\int_{\Omega_1} (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2)dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$||u||_2 = \left(\int_{\Omega_2} (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2)dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

respectively.

The following Lemma shows that the set $\mathcal{M}$ is not empty.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $0 < \mu < 3$, $2 \le p < 6 - \mu$ and $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $v_j \neq 0$ for $j = 1, 2$, then there exists $(\beta_1, \beta_2) \in (0, +\infty)^2$ such that $\beta_1 v_1 + \beta_2 v_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ which means $\mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$ and moreover, $c_0 = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{M}} I(u) > 0$.*

Proof. Fix $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $v_i \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, and for the case $p = 2$, without loss of generality, we may additionally assume that

$$\|v_i\|_i^2 \neq \int_{\Omega_i} \Big(\int_{\Omega_i} \frac{|v_i|^2}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \Big) |v_i|^2 dx \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{2.3}$$

Adapt some ideas in [18] and [19] by changing variables $t_j = s_j^{\frac{1}{p}}$, we define the function

$$G(s_1, s_2) = I(s_1^{\frac{1}{p}} v_1 + s_2^{\frac{1}{p}} v_2) = \frac{s_1^{\frac{2}{p}}}{2} \|v_1\|_1^2 + \frac{s_2^{\frac{2}{p}}}{2} \|v_2\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2p} \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{\mu}{2}}} * (s_1 |v_1|^p + s_2 |v_2|^p) \right)^2 dx.$$

As G is a continuous function and $G(s_1, s_2) \to 0$ as $|(s_1, s_2)| \to +\infty$, we have that G possesses a global maximum point $(a, b) \in [0, +\infty)^2$. However, as G is strictly concave function, it follows that $(a, b) \in (0, +\infty)^2$, (a, b) is the unique global maximum point and $\nabla G(a, b) = (0, 0)$, which implies that $\mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$. Here, we would like to point out that if $p > 2$, it is easy to check that $a, b \neq 0$. While for the case $p = 2$, we are able to show this fact only with the restriction (2.3). In fact, argue by contradiction that $a = 0$, notice that $(0, b)$ is the maximum point of G then there holds

$$\|v_2\|_2^2 = b^2 \int_{\Omega_2} \Big(\int_{\Omega_2} \frac{|v_2|^2}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \Big) |v_2|^2 dx,$$

therefore $b \neq 1$. Consider the function $g : [0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$g(t) = G(0, b + \alpha t),$$

where α is to be determined later. A direct computation shows that

$$g'(0) = \frac{1}{2} \|v_1\|_1^2 - \frac{b}{2} \int_{\Omega_1} \int_{\Omega_2} \frac{|v_2|^2(y) |v_1|^2(x)}{|x-y|^\mu} dy dx + \frac{\alpha}{2} \Big(\|v_2\|_2^2 - b \int_{\Omega_2} \Big(\int_{\Omega_2} \frac{|v_2|^2}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \Big) |v_2|^2 dx \Big).$$

Consequently, if α is suitably chosen, we have

$$g'(0) > 0,$$

which obviously is a contradiction.

Next, we will show that $c_0 > 0$. To begin with, we recall that if $w \in \mathcal{M}$, then

$$\|w\|^2 = \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|w(y)|^p |w(x)|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy dx.$$

Using the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\|w\|^2 \le C \|w\|^4.$$

As $\|w\| \neq 0$, the last inequality yields there is $\tau > 0$ satisfying

$$\|w\|^2 \ge \tau, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{M}.$$

From this,

$$I(w) = I(w) - \frac{1}{2p} I'(w) w = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p} \right) \|w\|^2 \ge \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p} \right) \tau > 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{M}.$$

and so, $c_0 \ge \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p} \right) \tau > 0$. □

Let us state more a technical lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $0 < \mu < 3$, $2 \le p < 6 - \mu$ and (w_n) be a bounded sequence in $\mathcal{M}$ with $w_n \rightharpoonup w$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. If $\|w_{n,j}\| \not\to 0$, then $w_j \neq 0$, where $w_{n,j} = w_n|_{\Omega_j}$ and $w_j = w|_{\Omega_j}$ for $j = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $w_1 = 0$. By the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality and the Sobolev embeddings, we see that

$$\int_{\Omega_j} \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|w_n|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \right) |w_{n,1}|^p dx \to 0.$$

On the other hand, as $I'(w_n)(w_{n,j}) = 0$, or equivalently

$$\|w_{n,1}\|_1^2 = \int_{\Omega_1} \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|w_n|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \right) |w_{n,1}|^p dx,$$

we derive that

$$\|w_{n,1}\|_1^2 \to 0$$

which is an absurd. The case $w_2 \neq 0$ is made of similar way. □

Now, we are able to show the existence of least energy solution for $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$.

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

From Lemma 2.1, $c_0 > 0$ and there is a sequence $(w_n) \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\lim_n I(w_n) = c_0.$$

It is easy to see that (w_n) is a bounded sequence. Hence, without loss of generality, we may suppose that $w_n \rightharpoonup w$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $w_n \to w$ in $L^q(\Omega)$ $\forall\, q \in [1, 6)$, as $n \to \infty$. By considering the function

$$G(s_1, s_2) = I(s_1^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_n)_1 + s_2^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_n)_2) = \frac{s_1^{\frac{2}{p}}}{2}\|(w_n)_1\|_1^2 + \frac{s_2^{\frac{2}{p}}}{2}\|(w_n)_2\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2p}\int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{|x|^{\frac{\mu}{2}}} * (s_1|(w_n)_1|^p + s_2|(w_n)_2|^p) \right)^2 dx.$$

we know by the previous study that $\nabla G(1, 1) = (0, 0)$. As G is strictly concave function, $(1, 1)$ is its global maximum point. Thus,

$$I(w_n) = I((w_n)_1 + (w_n)_2) = \max_{t,s \ge 0} I(t(w_n)_1 + s(w_n)_2).$$

Using the above information, we also know that $w_j \neq 0$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then, by Lemma 2.1 there are $t_1, t_2 > 0$ such that

$$t_1 w_1 + t_2 w_2 \in \mathcal{M},$$

and so,

$$c_0 \le I(t_1 w_1 + t_2 w_2).$$

By using the fact that $w_n \rightharpoonup w$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and the compact Sobolev embeddings, we get

$$I(t_1 w_1 + t_2 w_2) \le \liminf_{n \to +\infty} I(t_1(w_n)_1 + t_2(w_n)_2) \le \liminf_{n \to +\infty} I(w_n) = c_0,$$

from where it follows that

$$c_0 = I(t_1 w_1 + t_2 w_2) \quad \text{with} \quad t_1 w_1 + t_2 w_2 \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Now, we we will show that $w_* = t_1 w_1 + t_2 w_2$ is a critical point for I. Assume by contradiction that $\|I'(w_*)\| > 0$ and fix $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\|I'(w_*)\| \geq \alpha.$$

Moreover, we will fix $r > 0$ small enough such that if $(t,s) \in B = B_r(1,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, then there exists some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$I(t^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_1 + s^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_2) < c_0 - 2\epsilon_0, \quad \forall (t,s) \in \partial B. \tag{2.4}$$

In the sequel we fix $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ and $\delta > 0$ small emough such that

$$\|I'(u)\| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \geq \frac{4\epsilon}{\delta} \quad \forall u \in I^{-1}\{[c_0 - 2\epsilon, c_0 + 2\epsilon]\} \cap S$$

where

$$S = \{t^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_1 + s^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_2 \,:\, (t,s) \in \overline{B}\}.$$

By using the Deformation Lemma, there exists a continuous map $\eta : H_0^1(\Omega) \to H_0^1(\Omega)$, such that

$$\eta(u) = u \quad \forall u \notin I^{-1}\{[c_0 - 2\epsilon, c_0 + 2\epsilon]\} \cap S \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\eta(I^{c_0+\epsilon} \cap S) \subset I^{c_0-\epsilon} \cap S_\delta \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$S_\delta = \{v \in H_0^1(\Omega) \,:\, dist(v, S) \leq \delta\}.$$

In the sequel, we fix $\delta > 0$ of a way that

$$v \in S_\delta \Rightarrow v_1, v_2 \neq 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Now, setting $\gamma(t,s) = \eta(t^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_1 + s^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_2)$, (2.4) and (2.5) imply that

$$\gamma(s,t) = t^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_1 + s^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_2, \quad \forall (s,t) \in \partial B. \tag{2.8}$$

Moreover, since

$$\max_{t,s \geq 0} I(t^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_1 + s^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_2) = I(t_1()w_*)_1 + t_2(w_*)_2) = c_0,$$

by (2.6), we know

$$I(\gamma(t,s)) \leq c_0 - \epsilon.$$

Claim 2.3. *There is $(t_0, s_0) \in B$ such that*

$$\big(I'(\gamma(t_0,s_0))(\gamma(t_0,s_0)_1), I'(\gamma(t_0,s_0))(\gamma(t_0,s_0)_2)\big) = (0,0).$$

Assuming for a moment the claim is true, we deduce that $\gamma(t_0, s_0) \in \mathcal{M}$, and so,

$$c_0 \leq I(\gamma(t_0,s_0)) \leq c_0 - \epsilon$$

which is absurd. Here, (2.7) was used to ensure that $\gamma(t_0,s_0)_j \neq 0$ for $j = 1, 2$. Consequently, $w_* = t_1 w_1 + t_2 w_2$ is a critical point for I.

Proof of Claim 2.3: First of all, note that

$$\big(I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_1), I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_2)\big) = (0,0) \Leftrightarrow \big(\frac{1}{t}I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_1), \frac{1}{s}I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_2)\big) = (0,0)$$

and by (2.8)

$$\big(\frac{1}{t}I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_1),\frac{1}{s}I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_2)\big)=\big(\frac{1}{t}I'(\gamma_0(t,s))(\gamma_0(t,s)_1),\frac{1}{s}I'(\gamma_0(t,s))(\gamma_0(t,s)_2)\big)\quad\forall(t,s)\in\partial B$$

where

$$\gamma_0(t,s)=t^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_1+s^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_2\quad\forall(s,t)\in\overline{B}.$$

Considering the function

$$G(t,s)=I(t^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_1+s^{\frac{1}{p}}(w_*)_2),$$

we deduce that

$$(\frac{1}{t}I'(\gamma_0(t,s))(\gamma_0(t,s)_1),\frac{1}{s}I'(\gamma_0(t,s))(\gamma_0(t,s)_2))=\nabla G(t,s)\quad\forall(t,s)\in\overline{B}.$$

Since G is is strictly concave function and $\nabla G(1,1)=(0,0)$, it follows that

$$0>\langle\nabla G(t,s)-\nabla G(1,1),(t,s)-(1,1)\rangle=\langle\nabla G(t,s),(t,s)-(1,1)\rangle\quad\forall(s,t)\neq(1,1),$$

and so,

$$0>\langle\nabla G(t,s),(t,s)-(1,1)\rangle\quad\text{for}\quad|(s,t)-(1,1)|=r.$$

Setting $H:\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$H(t,s)=\big(\frac{1}{t}I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_1),\frac{1}{s}I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_2)\big)$$

and $f(t,s)=H(t+1,s+1)$, we have that

$$0>\langle f(t,s),(t,s)\rangle\quad\text{for}\quad|(s,t)|=r.$$

By using the Brouwer's fixed point Theorem, we know there exists $(t_*,s_*)\in B_r(0,0)$ such that $f(t_*,s_*)=(0,0)$, that is,

$$H(t_*+1,s_*+1)=(0,0),$$

from where it follows that there is $(t_0,s_0)\in B$ such that

$$\big(I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_1),I'(\gamma(t,s))(\gamma(t,s)_2)\big)=(0,0),$$

which completes the proof of the claim.

3 The $(PS)_c$ condition for I_λ

In this section, we will prove some convergence properties for the (PS) sequences of the functional I_λ. Our main goal is to prove that, for given $c\geq 0$ independent of λ, the functional I_λ satisfies the $(PS)_d$ condition for $d\in[0,c)$, provided that λ is large enough.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(u_n)\subset E_\lambda$ be a $(PS)_c$ sequence for I_λ, then (u_n) is bounded. Furthermore, $c\geq 0$.*

Proof. Since (u_n) is a $(PS)_c$ sequence,

$$I_\lambda(u_n)\to c\text{ and }I'_\lambda(u_n)\to 0.$$

Then, for n large enough

$$I_\lambda(u_n)-\frac{1}{2p}I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n\leq c+1+\|u_n\|_\lambda.\tag{3.1}$$

On the other hand,

$$I_\lambda(u_n) - \frac{1}{2p} I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p}\right) \|u_n\|^2_\lambda. \tag{3.2}$$

Therefore, from (3.1) and (3.2) we get the inequality below

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p}\right) \|u_n\|^2_\lambda \leq c + 1 + \|u_n\|_\lambda,$$

which shows the boundedness of (u_n). Thereby, by (3.2),

$$0 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p}\right) \|u_n\|^2_\lambda \leq c + o_n(1), \tag{3.3}$$

and the lemma follows by taking the limit of $n \to +\infty$. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let $(u_n) \subset E_\lambda$ be a $(PS)_0$ sequence for I_λ. Then $u_n \to 0$ in E_λ.*

Proof. An immediate consequence of the arguments used in the proof of Lemma 3.1. □

Next we prove a splitting property for the functional I_λ, which is related to the Brezis-Lieb type Lemma for nonlocal nonlinearities [3, 27].

Lemma 3.3. *Let $c \geq 0$ and (u_n) be a $(PS)_c$ sequence for I_λ. If $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in E_λ, then*

$$I_\lambda(v_n) - I_\lambda(u_n) + I_\lambda(u) = o_n(1) \tag{3.4}$$

$$I'_\lambda(v_n) - I'_\lambda(u_n) + I'_\lambda(u) = o_n(1), \tag{3.5}$$

where $v_n = u_n - u$. Furthermore, (v_n) is a $(PS)_{c-I_\lambda(u)}$ sequence.

Proof. First of all, note that

$$I_\lambda(v_n) - I_\lambda(u_n) + I_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\|v_n\|^2_\lambda - \|u_n\|^2_\lambda + \|u\|^2_\lambda\right) - \\ - \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|v_n(y)|^p |v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(y)|^p |u_n(x)|^p + |u(y)|^p |u(x)|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\right) dx.$$

Since $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in E_λ, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(v_n) - I_\lambda(u_n) + I_\lambda(u) = \; & o_n(1) + \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|v_n(y)|^p \left(-|v_n(x)|^p + |u_n(x)|^p - |u(x)|^p\right)}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\right) dx \\ & + \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u_n(y)|^p \left(-|v_n(x)|^p + |u_n(x)|^p - |u(x)|^p\right)}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\right) dx \\ & + \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|u(y)|^p \left(-|v_n(x)|^p + |u_n(x)|^p - |u(x)|^p\right)}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\right) dx \\ & + \frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|v_n(y)|^p |u(x)|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\right) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

By the Hardy-Litllewood-Sobolev inequality,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|v_n(y)|^p \left(|v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p\right)}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\right) dx \leq C\,|v_n|^p_{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left||v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p\right|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} dx\right)^{\frac{6-\mu}{6}}.$$

Notice that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left||v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p\right|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} dx = \int_{B_R(0)} \left||v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p\right|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} dx + \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus B_R(0)} \left||v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p\right|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} dx. \tag{3.7}$$

where, $R > 0$ will be fixed subsequently. As $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in E_λ, we know that

- $u_n \to u$, in $L^{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}}(B_R(0))$;
- $u_n(x) \to u(x)$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3$,

and there is $h_1 \in L^{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}}(B_R(0))$ such that

$$|u_n(x)| \leq h_1(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^3.$$

From this,

$$|v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p \to 0 \ a.e. \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

and

$$\Big| |v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p \Big|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} \leq (2^p+1)^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} \left(h_1(x) + |u(x)|\right)^{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}} \in L^1(B_R(0)).$$

Thus, by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\int_{B_R(0)} \Big| |v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p \Big|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} dx \to 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Furthermore, we also have

$$\Big| \ |u_n(x) - u(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p \ \Big| \leq p2^{p-1}(|u_n(x)|^{p-1} \, |u(x)| + |u(x)|^p),$$

and so,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(0)} \Big| |u_n(x) - u(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p \Big|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} dx \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(0)} |u_n(x)|^{\frac{6(p-1)}{6-\mu}} \, |u(x)|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} \, dx + C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(0)} |u(x)|^{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}} \, dx.$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose $R > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(0)} |u(x)|^{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}} \, dx \leq \varepsilon,$$

the Hölder inequality combined with the boundedness of (u_n) implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(0)} \Big| |v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p \Big|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} dx \leq \varepsilon. \tag{3.9}$$

Gathering together the boundedness of (v_n) and (3.7)-(3.9), we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Big| |v_n(x)|^p - |u_n(x)|^p + |u(x)|^p \Big|^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}} dx \to 0.$$

To finish the proof, we need to prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|v_n(y)|^p |u(x)|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy \right) dx \to 0.$$

Once $v_n \rightharpoonup 0$ in E_λ and $p \in (2, 6-\mu)$, the sequence $(|v_n|^p)$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. As $v_n(x) \to 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3$, we ensure that $|v_n|^p$ converges weakly to 0 in $L^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Using again the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, we know that the linear functional $F : L^{\frac{6}{6-\mu}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$F(w) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * w \big) |u(x)|^p dx$$

is continuous. Consequently, $F(|v_n|^p) \to 0$, or equivalently,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |v_n(x)|^p \big) |u(x)|^p dx \to 0,$$

and the proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let (u_n) be a $(PS)_c$ sequence for I_λ. Then $c = 0$, or there exists $c_* > 0$, independent of λ, such that $c \geq c_*$, for all $\lambda > 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, we know $c \geq 0$. Suppose that $c > 0$. On one hand, we know

$$c + o_n(1)\|u_n\|_\lambda = I_\lambda(u_n) - \frac{1}{2p} I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n \geq \left(\frac{p-1}{2p}\right)\|u_n\|^2_\lambda,$$

equivalently,

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \|u_n\|^2_\lambda \leq \frac{2pc}{p-1}. \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand, the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality together with the Sobolev embedding theorems imply that

$$I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n \geq \frac{1}{2}\|u_n\|^2_\lambda - K\|u_n\|^{2p}_\lambda,$$

where K is a positive constant. Thus, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n \geq \frac{1}{4}\,||u_n||^2_\lambda, \text{ for } ||u_n||_\lambda < \delta. \tag{3.11}$$

Consider $c_* = \delta^2 \dfrac{p-1}{2p}$ and $c < c_*$. Then it follows that

$$\|u_n\|_\lambda \leq \delta \tag{3.12}$$

for n large enough. Hence,

$$I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n \geq \frac{1}{4}\|u_n\|^2_\lambda,$$

and thus

$$\|u_n\|^2_\lambda \to 0.$$

Thereby,

$$I_\lambda(u_n) \to I_\lambda(0) = 0,$$

which contradicts the fact that (u_n) is a $(PS)_c$ sequence with $c > 0$. Therefore, $c \geq c_*$. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let (u_n) be a $(PS)_c$ sequence for I_λ. Then, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ independent of λ, such that*

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} |u_n|^{2p}_{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}} \geq \delta_0 c.$$

Proof. Note that

$$c = \lim_{n\to+\infty}\left(I_\lambda(u_n) - \frac{1}{2}I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n\right) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p}\right)\lim_{n\to+\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\left(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u_n|^p\right)|u_n|^p dx,$$

by the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, we obtain

$$c \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p}\right) K \liminf_{n\to+\infty} |u_n|^{2p}_{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}}.$$

Therefore, the conclusion follows by setting

$$\delta_0 = \left(\frac{p-1}{2p}\right) K^{-1} > 0.$$

□

Lemma 3.6. *Let $c_1 > 0$ be a constant independent of λ. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $\Lambda = \Lambda(\varepsilon)$ and $R = R(\varepsilon, c_1)$ such that, if (u_n) is a $(PS)_c$ sequence for I_λ with $c \in [0, c_1]$, then*

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} |u_n|^{2p}_{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}, B^c_R(0)} \leq \varepsilon, \ \forall \lambda \geq \Lambda.$$

Proof. For $R > 0$, consider

$$A(R) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 / \, |x| > R \text{ and } a(x) \geq M_0\}$$

and

$$B(R) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 / \, |x| > R \text{ and } a(x) < M_0\}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{A(R)} u_n^2 dx &\leq \frac{1}{(\lambda M_0 + 1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\lambda a(x) + 1) u_n^2 dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(\lambda M_0 + 1)} ||u_n||^2_\lambda \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(\lambda M_0 + 1)} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p} \right)^{-1} c + o_n(1) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(\lambda M_0 + 1)} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p} \right)^{-1} c_1 + o_n(1) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Once c_1 is independent of λ, by (3.13) there is $\Lambda > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \int_{A(R)} u_n^2 dx < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \ \forall \lambda \geq \Lambda. \tag{3.14}$$

On the other hand, using the Hölder inequality for $s \in [1, 3]$ and the continuous embedding $E_\lambda \hookrightarrow L^{2s}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, we see that

$$\int_{B(R)} u_n^2 dx \leq \beta \, ||u_n||^2_\lambda \, |B(R)|^{\frac{1}{s'}} \leq c_1 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p} \right)^{-1} |B(R)|^{\frac{1}{s'}} + o_n(1),$$

where β is a positive constant. Now, by assumption (1.4) on the potential $a(x)$, we know that

$$|B(R)| \to 0, \text{ when } R \to +\infty,$$

then we can choose R large enough such that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \int_{B(R)} u_n^2 dx < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{3.15}$$

Using (3.14) and (3.15), we obtain that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_n^2 dx < \varepsilon.$$

The last inequality combined with interpolation implies that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_R(0)} |u_n|^{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}} dx < \varepsilon, \ \lambda > \Lambda,$$

by increasing R and Λ if necessary. □

Proposition 3.7. *Given $c_1 > 0$, independent of λ, there exists $\Lambda = \Lambda(c_1) > 0$ such that if $\lambda \geq \Lambda$, then I_λ verifies the $(PS)_c$ condition for all $c \in [0, c_1]$.*

Proof. Let (u_n) be a $(PS)_c$ sequence. Lemma 3.1 implies that (u_n) is bounded. Passing to a subsequence if necessary,

$$\begin{cases} u_n \rightharpoonup u, \ \text{ in } E_\lambda; \\ u_n(x) \to u(x), \ \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^3; \\ u_n \to u, \ \text{in } L^s_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3), 1 \leq s < 6. \end{cases}$$

Then, $I'_\lambda(u) = 0$ and $I_\lambda(u) \geq 0$. Setting $v_n = u_n - u$, Lemma 3.3 ensures that (v_n) is a $(PS)_d$ sequence with $d = c - I_\lambda(u)$. Furthermore,

$$0 \leq d = c - I_\lambda(u) \leq c \leq c_1$$

We claim that $d = 0$. Otherwise, suppose that $d > 0$. By Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5, we know $d \geq c_*$ and

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} |v_n|^{2p}_{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}} \geq \delta_0 c_* > 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Applying Lemma 3.6 with $\varepsilon = \dfrac{\delta_0 c_*}{2} > 0$, there exist $\Lambda, R > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} |v_n|^{2p}_{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}, B^C_R(0)} \leq \frac{\delta_0 c_*}{2}, \ \text{for } \lambda \geq \Lambda. \tag{3.17}$$

Combining (3.16) and (3.17), we obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} |v_n|^{2p}_{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}, B_R(0)} \geq \frac{\delta_0 c_*}{2} > 0,$$

which is absurd, because as $v_n \rightharpoonup 0$ in E_λ, the compact embedding $E_\lambda \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}}(B_R(0))$ implies that

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} |v_n|^{2p}_{\frac{6p}{6-\mu}, B_r(0)} = 0.$$

Thereby, $d = 0$ and (v_n) is a $(PS)_0$ sequence. Hence, by Corollary 3.2, $v_n \to 0$ in E_λ. Thus, I_λ satisfies the $(PS)_c$ condition for $c \in [0, c_1]$ if λ is large enough. □

4 The $(PS)_\infty$ condition

A sequence $(u_n) \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is called a $(PS)_\infty$ *sequence for the family* $(I_\lambda)_{\lambda\geq 1}$, if there exist $d \in [0, c_\Gamma]$ and a sequence $(\lambda_n) \subset [1, \infty)$ with $\lambda_n \to \infty$, such that

$$I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to d \text{ and } \left\|I'_{\lambda_n}(u_n)\right\|_{E^*_{\lambda_n}} \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $0 < \mu < 3$, $2 \leq p < 6 - \mu$ and $(u_n) \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is a $(PS)_\infty$ sequence for $(I_\lambda)_{\lambda>1}$ with $0 < d \leq c_\Gamma$. Then, up to subsequence, there exists $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Furthermore,*

(i) $u_n \to u$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$;

(ii) $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega$ and $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ is a solution for

$$-\Delta u + u = \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\Big)|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in } \Omega;$$

(iii) $\lambda_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a(x)|u_n|^2 \to 0$;

(iv) $\|u_n - u\|^2_{\lambda,\Omega} \to 0$;

(v) $\|u_n\|^2_{\lambda,\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega} \to 0$;

(vi) $I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2)dx - \frac{1}{2p}\int_\Omega \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|u|^p dx$.

Proof. By hypothesis,

$$I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to d \text{ and } \|I'_{\lambda_n}(u_n)\|_{E'_{\lambda_n}} \to 0.$$

Then, the same arguments employed in the proof of Lemma 3.1 imply that $(\|u_n\|_{\lambda_n})$ and (u_n) are bounded in $\mathbb{R}$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ respectively. And so, up to subsequence, there exists $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and } u_n(x) \to u(x) \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Now, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $C_m = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 ; a(x) \geq \frac{1}{m}\right\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\lambda_n < 2(\lambda_n - 1)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus

$$\int_{C_m} |u_n|^2 dx \leq \frac{2m}{\lambda_n}\int_{C_m} \big(\lambda_n a(x) + 1\big)|u_n|^2 dx \leq \frac{C}{\lambda_n}.$$

By Fatou's lemma, we derive that

$$\int_{C_m} |u|^2 dx = 0,$$

which implies that $u = 0$ in C_m, and so, $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. From this, we are able to prove $(i) - (vi)$.

(i) By a simple computation, we see that

$$\|u_n - u\|^2_{\lambda_n} = I'_{\lambda_n}(u_n)u_n - I'_{\lambda_n}(u_n)u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u_n|^p\big)|u_n|^{p-2}u_n(u_n - u)dx + o_n(1),$$

then,

$$\|u_n - u\|^2_{\lambda_n} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u_n|^p\big)|u_n|^{p-2}u_n(u_n - u)dx + o_n(1).$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.3,

$$\|u_n - u\|^2_{\lambda_n} \to 0,$$

which means that $u_n \to u$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

(ii) Since $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, we know $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $u|_{\Omega_j} \in H^1_0(\Omega_j)$, for $j \in \{1, 2..., k\}$. Moreover, taking into account that $u_n \to u$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $I'_{\lambda_n}(u_n)\varphi \to 0$ for $\varphi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega)$, we get

$$\int_\Omega (\nabla u \nabla \varphi + u\varphi)dx - \int_\Omega \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|u|^{p-2}u\varphi dx = 0, \tag{4.1}$$

which shows that $u|_\Omega$ is a solution for the nonlocal problem

$$-\Delta u + u = \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

(iii) In view of (i),

$$\lambda_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a(x)|u_n|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \lambda_n a(x)|u_n - u|^2 dx \leq \|u_n - u\|^2_{\lambda_n}.$$

Then

$$\lambda_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a(x)|u_n|^2 dx \to 0.$$

(iv) For each $j \in \{1, 2..., k\}$,

$$|u_n - u|^2_{2,\Omega_j}, |\nabla u_n - \nabla u|^2_{2,\Omega_j} \to 0. \quad (\text{see} \quad (i)).$$

Therefore,

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^2 - |\nabla u|^2)dx \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_\Omega (|u_n|^2 - |u|^2)dx \to 0.$$

In view of (iii), we know

$$\int_\Omega \lambda_n a(x)|u_n|^2 dx \to 0,$$

then

$$\|u_n\|^2_{\lambda_n,\Omega} \to \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2)dx.$$

(v) Summarizing (i) and $\|u_n - u\|^2_{\lambda_n} \to 0$, we obtain

$$\|u_n\|^2_{\lambda_n,\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega} \to 0.$$

(vi) We can write the functional I_{λ_n} in the following way

$$I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^2 + (\lambda_n a(x) + 1)|u_n|^2)dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega} (|\nabla u_n|^2 + (\lambda_n a(x) + 1)|u_n|^2)dx$$
$$- \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega} \big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u_n|^p\big)|u_n|^p dx - \frac{1}{2p}\int_\Omega \big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u_n|^p\big)|u_n|^p dx.$$

Using $(i) - (v)$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^2 + (\lambda_n a(x) + 1)|u_n|^2)dx \to \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2)dx,$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega} (|\nabla u_n|^2 + (\lambda_n a(x) + 1)|u_n|^2)dx \to 0,$$

$$\int_\Omega \big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u_n|^p\big)|u_n|^p dx \to \int_\Omega \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|u|^p dx,$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega} \big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |u_n|^p\big)|u_n|^p dx \to 0.$$

Therefore, we can conclude that

$$I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2)dx - \frac{1}{2p}\int_\Omega \Big(\int_\Omega \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|u|^p dx.$$

□

5 Further propositions for c_Γ

In the sequel, without loss of generality, we consider $\Gamma = \{1, \cdots, l\}$, with $l \leq k$. Moreover, let us denote by $\Omega'_\Gamma = \cup_{j\in\Gamma}\Omega'_j$, where Ω'_j is an open neighborhood of Ω_j with $\Omega'_j \cap \Omega'_i = \emptyset$ if $j \neq i$. Using this notion, we introduce the functional

$$I_{\lambda,\Gamma}(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega'_\Gamma}(|\nabla u|^2 + (\lambda a(x)+1)|u|^2)dx - \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\Omega'_\Gamma}\Big(\int_{\Omega'_\Gamma}\frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|u|^p dx,$$

which is the energy functional associated to the Choquard equation with Neumann boundary condition

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (\lambda a(x)+1)u = \Big(\displaystyle\int_{\Omega'_\Gamma}\frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|u|^{p-2}u, \text{ in } \Omega'_\Gamma, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} = 0, \text{ on } \partial\Omega'_\Gamma. \end{cases} \tag{CN_λ}$$

In what follows, we denote by c_Γ the number given by

$$c_\Gamma = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{M}_\Gamma} I_\Gamma(u)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_\Gamma = \{u \in \mathcal{N}_\Gamma : I'_\Gamma(u)u_j = 0 \text{ and } u_j \neq 0, \ \forall j \in \Gamma\}$$

with $u_j = u|_{\Omega_j}$ and

$$\mathcal{N}_\Gamma = \{u \in H^1(\Omega_\Gamma)\setminus\{0\} \ : \ I'_\Gamma(u)u = 0\}.$$

Similarly, we denote by $c_{\lambda,\Gamma}$ the number given by

$$c_{\lambda,\Gamma} = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{M}'_\Gamma} I_{\lambda,\Gamma}(u)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}'_\Gamma = \{u \in \mathcal{N}'_\Gamma : I'_{\lambda,\Gamma}(u)u_j = 0 \text{ and } u_j \neq 0, \ \forall j \in \Gamma\}$$

with $u_j = u|_{\Omega'_j}$ and

$$\mathcal{N}'_\Gamma = \{u \in H^1(\Omega'_\Gamma)\setminus\{0\} \ : \ I'_{\lambda,\Gamma}(u)u = 0\}.$$

Repeating the same arguments in Section 2, we know that there exist $w_\Gamma \in H^1_0(\Omega_\Gamma)$ and $w_{\lambda,\Gamma} \in H^1(\Omega'_\Gamma)$ such that

$$I_\Gamma(w_\Gamma) = c_\Gamma \text{ and } I'_\Gamma(w_\Gamma) = 0$$

and

$$I_{\lambda,\Gamma}(w_{\lambda,\Gamma}) = c_{\lambda,\Gamma} \text{ and } I'_{\lambda,\Gamma}(w_{\lambda,\Gamma}) = 0.$$

We have the following proposition, which describes an important relation between c_Γ and $c_{\lambda,\Gamma}$.

Lemma 5.1. *There holds that*

(i) $0 < c_{\lambda,\Gamma} \leq c_\Gamma$, $\forall\lambda \geq 0$;

(ii) $c_{\lambda,\Gamma} \to c_\Gamma$, *as* $\lambda \to \infty$.

Proof. (i) Since $H^1_0(\Omega_\Gamma) \subset H^1(\Omega'_\Gamma)$, it is easy to see that

$$0 < c_{\lambda,\Gamma} \leq c_\Gamma.$$

(ii) Let $\lambda_n \to \infty$. From the above commentaries, for each λ_n there exists $w_n \in H^1(\Omega')$ with

$$I_{\lambda_n,\Gamma}(w_n) = c_{\lambda_n,\Gamma} \text{ and } I'_{\lambda_n,\Gamma}(w_n) = 0.$$

As $\big(c_{\lambda_n,\Gamma}\big)$ is bounded, there exists (w_{n_i}), subsequence of (w_n), such that $(I_{\lambda_{n_i},\Gamma}(w_{n_i}))$ converges and $I'_{\lambda_{n_i},\Gamma}(w_{n_i}) = 0$. Repeating the same ideas explored in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we know that there exists $w \in H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma) \setminus \{0\} \subset H^1(\Omega'_\Gamma)$ such that

$$w_j = w|_{\Omega_j} \neq 0, \;\; j \in \Gamma$$

and

$$w_{n_i} \to w \text{ in } H^1(\Omega'_\Gamma), \text{ as } \; n_i \to \infty.$$

Furthermore, we also have that

$$c_{\lambda_{n_i},\Gamma} = I_{\lambda_{n_i},\Gamma}(w_{n_i}) \to I_\Gamma(w)$$

and

$$0 = I'_{\lambda_{n_i},\Omega'}(w_{n_i}) \to I'_\Gamma(w).$$

By the definition of c_Γ,

$$\lim_i c_{\lambda_{n_i},\Gamma} \geq c_\Gamma.$$

Then, combining the last limit with conclusion (i), we can guarantee that

$$c_{\lambda_{n_i},\Gamma} \to c_\Gamma, \text{ as } n_i \to \infty.$$

This establishes the asserted result. □

In the sequel, we denote by $w \in H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma)$ the least energy solution obtained in Section 2, that is,

$$w \in \mathcal{M}_\Gamma, \quad I_\Gamma(w) = c_\Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad I'_\Gamma(w) = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

Changing variables by $t_j = s_j^{\frac{1}{p}}$, it is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned} I_\Gamma\big(t_1w_1 + \cdots + t_lw_l\big) &= \sum_{j=1}^{l} \frac{t_j^2}{2}||w_j||_j^2 - \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\Omega_\Gamma}\left(\int_{\Omega_\Gamma} \frac{\big|\sum_{j=1}^{l} t_jw_j\big|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\right)\Big|\sum_{j=1}^{l} t_jw_j\Big|^p dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{l} \frac{s_j^{\frac{2}{p}}}{2}||w_j||_j^2 - \frac{1}{2p}\int_{\Omega_\Gamma}\left(\int_{\Omega_\Gamma} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{l} s_j|w_j|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\right)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{l} s_j|w_j|^p\Big)dx. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in [18],

$$\int_{\Omega_\Gamma}\left(\int_{\Omega_\Gamma} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{l} s_j|w_j|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\right)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{l} s_j|w_j|^p\Big)dx = \int_{\Omega_\Gamma}\left[\frac{1}{|x|^{\mu/2}} * \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{l} s_j|w_j|^p\Big)\right]^2 dx.$$

As $s \mapsto s^{2/p}$ is concave and $s \mapsto s^2$ is strictly convex, we concluded that the function

$$G(s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_l) = I_\Gamma(s_1^{\frac{1}{p}}w_1 + \cdots + s_l^{\frac{1}{p}}w_l)$$

is strictly concave with $\nabla G(1, \cdots, 1) = 0$. Hence, $(1, \cdots, 1)$ is the unique global maximum point of G on $[0, +\infty)^l$ with $G(1, \cdots, 1) = c_\Gamma$. In the sequel, we denote by $w \in H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma)$ the least energy solution obtained in Section 2, that is,

$$w \in \mathcal{M}_\Gamma, \quad I_\Gamma(w) = c_\Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad I'_\Gamma(w) = 0.$$

Assuming $p > 2$, there are $r > 0$ small enough and $R > 0$ large enough such that

$$I'_\Gamma(\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{l} t_j w_j(x) + Rw_i)(Rw_i) < 0, \quad \text{for } i \in \Gamma, \forall t_j \in [r, R] \ \text{ and } \ j \neq i, \tag{5.2}$$

$$I'_\Gamma(\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{l} t_j w_j(x) + rw_i)(rw_i) > 0, \quad \text{for } i \in \Gamma, \forall t_j \in [r, R] \ \text{ and } \ j \neq i. \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$I_\Gamma\big(\sum_{j=1}^{l} t_j w_j(x)\big) < c_\Gamma, \quad \forall (t_1, \cdots, t_l) \in \partial[r, R]^l, \tag{5.4}$$

where $w_j := w|_{\Omega_j}$, $j \in \Gamma$. Using these information, we can define

$$\gamma_0(t_1, \cdots, t_l)(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{l} t_j w_j(x) \in H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma), \ \forall (t_1, \cdots, t_l) \in [r, R]^l.$$

and denote by Γ_* the class of continuous pathes $\gamma \in C\big([r, R]^l, E_\lambda \setminus \{0\}\big)$ which satisfies the following conditions:

$$(a) \qquad \gamma = \gamma_0 \text{ on } \partial[r, R]^l,$$

and

$$(b) \qquad \Phi_\Gamma(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega'_\Gamma} \big(|\nabla\gamma|^2 + (\lambda a(x) + 1)|\gamma|^2\big)dx - \frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega'_\Gamma} \left(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu} * |\gamma|^p\right)|\gamma|^p dx \geq 0,$$

where $R > 1 > r > 0$ are the positive constants obtained in (5.2) and (5.3). Since $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma^*$, we know that $\Gamma_* \neq \emptyset$. And by (a) for the path γ and (5.4), we have

$$I_\lambda\big(\gamma(t_1, \cdots, t_l)\big) < c_\Gamma, \quad \forall (t_1, \cdots, t_l) \in \partial[r, R]^l, \forall \gamma \in \Gamma_*. \tag{5.5}$$

The following lemma will be used to describe the intersection property of the paths and the set $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma$ in the final section.

Lemma 5.2. *For all $\gamma \in \Gamma_*$, there exists $(t_1, \ldots, t_l) \in (r, R)^l$ such that*

$$I'_{\lambda,\Gamma}(\gamma(t_1, \ldots, t_l))\gamma_j(t_1, \ldots, t_l) = 0,$$

where $\gamma_j(t_1, \ldots, t_l) = \gamma(t_1, \ldots, t_l)|_{\Omega'_j}$, $j \in \Gamma$.

Proof. Since $p > 2$ and $\gamma = \gamma_0$ on $\partial[r, R]^l$, by using of (5.2) and (5.3), we see that the result follows by Miranda's Theorem [24]. □

6 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we are ready to find nonnegative solutions u_λ for large values of λ, which converges to a least energy solution of $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. To this end, we will prove two propositions which, together with Propositions 4.1, will help us to show the main result in Theorem 1.2.

Henceforth, we denote by

$$\Theta = \Big\{u \in E_\lambda \,:\, \|u\|_{\lambda,\Omega'_j} > \frac{r\tau}{2} \ \ j = 1, \cdots, l\Big\},$$

where r was fixed in (5.2) and τ is the positive constant such that

$$\|u_j\|_j > \tau, \quad \forall u \in \Upsilon_\Gamma = \{u \in \mathcal{M}_\Gamma \,:\, I_\Gamma(u) = c_\Gamma\} \quad \text{and} \quad \forall j \in \Gamma.$$

Furthermore, $I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma}$ denotes the set

$$I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma} = \big\{u \in E_\lambda \,;\, I_\lambda(u) \le c_\Gamma\big\}.$$

Fixing $\delta = \dfrac{r\tau}{8}$, for $\xi > 0$ small enough, we set

$$\mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda = \Big\{u \in \Theta_{2\delta} \,:\, \Phi_\Gamma(u) \ge 0,\, ||u||_{\lambda,\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'} \le \xi \,\text{and}\, |I_\lambda(u) - c_\Gamma| \le \xi\Big\}. \tag{6.1}$$

We observe that

$$w \in \mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma},$$

showing that $\mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma} \neq \emptyset$. We have the following uniform estimate of $\big\|I_\lambda'(u)\big\|_{E_\lambda^*}$ on the region $\big(\mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda \setminus \mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda\big) \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma}$.

Proposition 6.1. *For each $\xi > 0$, there exist $\Lambda_* \ge 1$ and $\sigma_0 > 0$ independent of λ such that*

$$\big\|I_\lambda'(u)\big\|_{E_\lambda^*} \ge \sigma_0, \ \textit{for } \lambda \ge \Lambda_* \ \textit{and } u \in \big(\mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda \setminus \mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda\big) \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma}. \tag{6.2}$$

Proof. We assume that there exist $\lambda_n \to \infty$ and $u_n \in \Big(\mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^{\lambda_n} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\xi^{\lambda_n}\Big) \cap I_{\lambda_n}^{c_\Gamma}$ such that

$$\big\|I_{\lambda_n}'(u_n)\big\|_{E_{\lambda_n}^*} \to 0.$$

Since $u_n \in \mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^{\lambda_n}$, we know $(\|u_n\|_{\lambda_n})$ and $\big(I_{\lambda_n}(u_n)\big)$ are both bounded. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $(I_{\lambda_n}(u_n))$ converges. Thus, from Proposition 4.1, there exists $u \in H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma)$ such that u is a solution for

$$-\Delta u + u = \Big(\int_{\Omega_\Gamma} \frac{|u|^p}{|x-y|^\mu} dy\Big)|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in } \Omega_\Gamma$$

with

$$u_n \to u \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^3),\ \|u_n\|_{\lambda_n,\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega} \to 0 \text{ and } I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to I_\Gamma(u).$$

As $(u_n) \subset \Theta_{2\delta}$, we derive that

$$\|u_n\|_{\lambda_n,\Omega_j'} > \frac{r\tau}{4},\ \ j = 1, \cdots, l.$$

Letting $n \to +\infty$, we get the inequality

$$\|u\|_j \ge \frac{r\tau}{4} > 0,\ \ j = 1, \cdots, l,$$

which yields $u_{|\Omega_j} \neq 0$, $j = 1, \cdots, l$ and $I_\Gamma'(u) = 0$. Consequently, $I_\Gamma(u) \ge c_\Gamma$. However, from the fact that $I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \le c_\Gamma$ and $I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to I_\Gamma(u)$, we derive that $I_\Gamma(u) = c_\Gamma$, and so, $u \in \Upsilon_\Gamma$. Thus, for n large enough

$$\|u_n\|_j > \frac{r\tau}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad |I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) - c_\Gamma| \le \xi,\ \ j = 1, \cdots, l.$$

So $u_n \in \mathcal{A}_\xi^{\lambda_n}$, which is a contradiction, finishing the proof. □

In the sequel, ξ_1, ξ^* will be defined as

$$\xi_1 = \min_{(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in\partial[r,R]^l} |I_\Gamma(\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)) - c_\Gamma| > 0$$

and

$$\xi^* = \min\{\xi_1/2, \delta, \rho/2\},$$

where δ was given in(6.1) and

$$\rho = 4R^2 c_\Gamma,$$

where R was fixed in (5.2). Moreover, for each $s > 0$, B_s^λ denotes the set

$$B_s^\lambda = \left\{u \in E_\lambda\,;\, \|u\|_\lambda^2 \le s\right\} \text{ for } s > 0.$$

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose that $0 < \mu < 3$ and $2 < p < 6 - \mu$. Let $\xi \in (0, \xi^*)$ and $\Lambda_* \ge 1$ given in the previous proposition. Then, for $\lambda \ge \Lambda_*$, there exists a solution u_λ of (C_λ) such that $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma} \cap B_{2\rho+1}^\lambda$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \ge \Lambda_*$. Assume that there are no critical points of I_λ in $\mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma} \cap B_{2\rho+1}^\lambda$. Since I_λ verifies the $(PS)_d$ condition with $0 < d \le c_\Gamma$, there exists a constant $\nu_\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\left\|I'_\lambda(u)\right\|_{E_\lambda^*} \ge \nu_\lambda, \text{ for all } u \in \mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma} \cap B_{2\rho+1}^\lambda.$$

From Proposition 6.1, we have

$$\left\|I'_\lambda(u)\right\|_{E_\lambda^*} \ge \sigma_0, \text{ for all } u \in \left(\mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda \setminus \mathcal{A}_\xi^\lambda\right) \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma},$$

where $\sigma_0 > 0$ is small enough and it does not depend on λ. In what follows, $\Psi\colon E_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous functional verifying

$$\Psi(u) = 1, \text{ for } u \in \mathcal{A}_{\frac{3}{2}\xi}^\lambda \cap \Theta_\delta \cap B_{2\rho}^\lambda,$$

$$\Psi(u) = 0, \text{ for } u \notin \mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda \cap \Theta_{2\delta} \cap B_{2\rho+1}^\lambda$$

and

$$0 \le \Psi(u) \le 1, \forall u \in E_\lambda.$$

We also consider $H\colon I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma} \to E_\lambda$ given by

$$H(u) = \begin{cases} -\Psi(u)\left\|Y(u)\right\|^{-1} Y(u), \text{ for } u \in \mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda \cap B_{2\rho+1}^\lambda, \\ 0, \text{ for } u \notin \mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda \cap B_{2\rho+1}^\lambda, \end{cases}$$

where Y is a pseudo-gradient vector field for I_λ on $\mathcal{K} = \{u \in E_\lambda\,;\, I'_\lambda(u) \ne 0\}$. Observe that H is well defined, once $I'_\lambda(u) \ne 0$, for $u \in \mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda \cap I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma}$. The inequality

$$\left\|H(u)\right\| \le 1, \forall \lambda \ge \Lambda_* \text{ and } u \in I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma},$$

guarantees that the deformation flow $\eta\colon [0,\infty) \times I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma} \to I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma}$ defined by

$$\frac{d\eta}{dt} = H(\eta),\ \eta(0,u) = u \in I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma}$$

verifies

$$\frac{d}{dt} I_\lambda\big(\eta(t,u)\big) \le -\Psi\big(\eta(t,u)\big)\left\|I'_\lambda\big(\eta(t,u)\big)\right\| \le 0, \tag{6.3}$$

$$\left\|\frac{d\eta}{dt}\right\|_\lambda = \left\|H(\eta)\right\|_\lambda \le 1 \tag{6.4}$$

and

$$\eta(t,u)=u \text{ for all } t\geq 0 \text{ and } u\in I_\lambda^{c_\Gamma}\setminus \mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda\cap B_{2\rho+1}^\lambda. \tag{6.5}$$

We study now two paths, which are relevant for what follows:

- The path $(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\mapsto \eta\big(t,\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big),$ where $(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l$.

  Since $\xi\in(0,\xi^*)$, we have that

$$\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\notin \mathcal{A}_{2\xi}^\lambda,\ \forall (t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in\partial[r,R]^l.$$

and

$$I_\lambda\big(\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)<c_\Gamma,\ \forall (t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in\partial[r,R]^l.$$

Once $\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in\Theta_{2\delta}$, for all $(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l$, (6.5) gives that

$$\eta\big(t,\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)|_{\Omega_j'}\neq 0,\quad t\geq 0.$$

Moreover, it is also easy to see that

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega'}\big(|\nabla\eta\big(t,\gamma_0\big)|^2+(\lambda a(x)+1)|\eta\big(t,\gamma_0\big)|^2\big)dx-\frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega'}\left(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu}*|\eta\big(t,\gamma_0\big)|^p\right)|\eta\big(t,\gamma_0\big)|^p dx\geq 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\eta\big(t,\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)\in\Gamma_*,\quad t\geq 0.$$

- The path $(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\mapsto \gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l),$ where $(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l$.

  We observe that

$$\mathrm{supp}\big(\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)\subset\overline{\Omega_\Gamma}$$

and

$$I_\lambda\big(\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)\text{ does not depend on }\lambda\geq 1,$$

for all $(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l$. Moreover,

$$I_\lambda\big(\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)\leq c_\Gamma,\ \forall (t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l$$

and

$$I_\lambda\big(\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)=c_\Gamma \text{ if, and only if, } t_j=1,\ j=1,\cdots,l.$$

Therefore

$$m_0=\sup\big\{I_\lambda(u)\,;\,u\in\gamma_0\big([r,R]^l\big)\setminus A_\xi^\lambda\big\}$$

is independent of λ and $m_0<c_\Gamma$. In the following, we suppose that there exists $K_*>0$ such that

$$\big|I_\lambda(u)-I_\lambda(v)\big|\leq K_*\|u-v\|_\lambda,\ \forall u,v\in\mathcal{B}_{2\rho}^\lambda.$$

Now, we will prove that

$$\max_{(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l} I_\lambda\Big(\eta\big(T,\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)\Big)\leq c_\Gamma-\frac{\sigma_0\xi}{2K_*}, \tag{6.6}$$

for $T>0$ large. In fact, writing $u=\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)$, $(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l$, if $u\notin A_\xi^\lambda$, from (6.3), we deduce that

$$I_\lambda\big(\eta(t,u)\big)\leq I_\lambda(u)\leq m_0,\ \forall t\geq 0,$$

and we have nothing more to do. And so we assume that $u \in A_\xi^\lambda$ and set

$$\widetilde{\eta}(t) = \eta(t,u), \quad \widetilde{\nu_\lambda} = \min\{\nu_\lambda, \sigma_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad T = \frac{\sigma_0 \xi}{K_* \widetilde{\nu_\lambda}}.$$

Now, we will discuss two cases:

Case 1: $\widetilde{\eta}(t) \in \mathcal{A}^\lambda_{\frac{3}{2}\xi} \cap \Theta_\delta \cap B^\lambda_{2\rho}$, $\forall t \in [0,T]$.
Case 2: $\widetilde{\eta}(t_0) \notin \mathcal{A}^\lambda_{\frac{3}{2}\xi} \cap \Theta_\delta \cap B^\lambda_{2\rho}$, for some $t_0 \in [0,T]$.

Analysis of Case 1

In this case, we have $\Psi\big(\widetilde{\eta}(t)\big) = 1$ and $\big\|I'_\lambda\big(\widetilde{\eta}(t)\big)\big\| \geq \widetilde{\nu_\lambda}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. Hence, from (6.3), we know

$$I_\lambda\big(\widetilde{\eta}(T)\big) = I_\lambda(u) + \int_0^T \frac{d}{ds} I_\lambda\big(\widetilde{\eta}(s)\big)\, ds \leq c_\Gamma - \int_0^T \widetilde{\nu_\lambda}\, ds,$$

that is,

$$I_\lambda\big(\widetilde{\eta}(T)\big) \leq c_\Gamma - \widetilde{\nu_\lambda} T \leq c_\Gamma - \frac{\sigma_0 \xi}{2K_*},$$

showing (6.6).

Analysis of Case 2: In this case we have the following situations:

(a): There exists $T_2 \in [0,T]$ such that $\tilde{\eta}(t_2) \notin \Theta_\delta$. Let $T_1 = 0$ it follows that

$$\|\tilde{\eta}(T_2) - \tilde{\eta}(T_1)\| \geq \delta > \mu,$$

because $\tilde{\eta}(T_1) = u \in \Theta$.
(b): There exists $T_2 \in [0,T]$ such that $\tilde{\eta}(T_2) \notin B^\lambda_{2\rho}$. Let $T_1 = 0$, we get

$$\|\tilde{\eta}(T_2) - \tilde{\eta}(T_1)\| \geq \rho > \mu,$$

since $\tilde{\eta}(T_1) = u \in B^\lambda_\rho$.

(c): $\tilde{\eta}(t) \in \Theta_\delta \cap B^\lambda_{2\rho}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, and there are $0 \leq T_1 \leq T_2 \leq T$ such that $\tilde{\eta}(t) \in \mathcal{A}^\lambda_{\frac{3}{2}\xi} \setminus \mathcal{A}^\lambda_\xi$ for all $t \in [T_1, T_2]$ with

$$|I_\lambda(\tilde{\eta}(T_1)) - c_\Gamma| = \xi \ \text{ and } \ |I_\lambda(\tilde{\eta}(T_2)) - c_\Gamma| = \frac{3\xi}{2}$$

From definition of K_*, we have

$$\|\tilde{\eta}(T_2) - \tilde{\eta}(T_1)\| \geq \frac{1}{K_*}\big|I_\lambda(\tilde{\eta}(T_2)) - I_\lambda(\tilde{\eta}(T_1))\big| \geq \frac{1}{2K_*}\xi,$$

then the mean value theorem implies that $T_2 - T_1 \geq \dfrac{1}{2K_*}\xi$. Notice that

$$I_\lambda\big(\widetilde{\eta}(T)\big) \leq I_\lambda(u) - \int_0^T \Psi\big(\widetilde{\eta}(s)\big)\big\|I'_\lambda\big(\widetilde{\eta}(s)\big)\big\|\, ds,$$

we can deduce that

$$I_\lambda\big(\widetilde{\eta}(T)\big) \leq c_\Gamma - \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \sigma_0\, ds = c_\Gamma - \sigma_0(T_2 - T_1) \leq c_\Gamma - \frac{\sigma_0 \xi}{2K_*},$$

which proves (6.6).

So, defining $\widehat{\eta}(t_1,\cdots,t_l)=\eta\big(T,\gamma_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)$, $(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l$, we have that $\widehat{\eta}\in\Gamma_*$ and

$$\max_{(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\in[r,R]^l} I_\lambda\big(\widehat{\eta}(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\big)\le c_\Gamma-\frac{\sigma_0\xi}{2K_*},\ \ \forall\lambda\ge\Lambda_*.$$

On the other hand, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
I_\lambda\big(\widehat{\eta}\big)&=\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(|\nabla\widehat{\eta}|^2+(\lambda a(x)+1)|\widehat{\eta}|^2)dx-\frac{1}{2p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu}*|\widehat{\eta}|^p\Big)|\widehat{\eta}|^p dx\\
&=\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_\Gamma'}(|\nabla\widehat{\eta}|^2+(\lambda a(x)+1)|\widehat{\eta}|^2)dx-\frac{1}{2p}\int_{\Omega_\Gamma'}\Big(\int_{\Omega_\Gamma'}\frac{|\widehat{\eta}|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|\widehat{\eta}|^p dx\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'}(|\nabla\widehat{\eta}|^2+(\lambda a(x)+1)|\widehat{\eta}|^2)dx-\frac{1}{2p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'}\Big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu}*|\widehat{\eta}|^p\Big)|\widehat{\eta}|^p dx\\
&\qquad-\frac{1}{2p}\int_{\Omega_\Gamma'}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'}\frac{|\widehat{\eta}|^p}{|x-y|^\mu}dy\Big)|\widehat{\eta}|^p dx\\
&\ge I_{\lambda,\Gamma}(\widehat{\eta})+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'}(|\nabla\widehat{\eta}|^2+(\lambda a(x)+1)|\widehat{\eta}|^2)dx-\frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'}\Big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu}*|\widehat{\eta}|^p\Big)|\widehat{\eta}|^p dx
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\widehat{\eta}\in\Gamma_*$, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'}(|\nabla\widehat{\eta}|^2+(\lambda a(x)+1)|\widehat{\eta}|^2)dx-\frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'}\Big(\frac{1}{|x|^\mu}*|\widehat{\eta}|^p\Big)|\widehat{\eta}|^p dx\ge 0,$$

and so,

$$I_\lambda\big(\widehat{\eta}\big)\ge I_{\lambda,\Gamma}(\widehat{\eta}).\tag{6.7}$$

By (6.6) and (6.7), applying Lemma 5.2, we have

$$c_{\lambda,\Gamma}\le\max\left\{m_0,c_\Gamma-\frac{\sigma_0\xi}{2K_*}\right\}\ \ \forall\lambda\ge\Lambda_*,$$

which leads to

$$\limsup_{\lambda\to+\infty}c_{\lambda,\Gamma}\le\max\left\{m_0,c_\Gamma-\frac{\sigma_0\xi}{2K_*}\right\}<c_\Gamma,$$

this contradicts with the conclusion (ii) of Lemma 5.1. □

[Proof of Theorem 1.2: Conclusion] From the last Proposition, there exists (u_{λ_n}) with $\lambda_n\to+\infty$ satisfying:

(a) $I'_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n})=0$, $\forall n\in\mathbb{N}$;

(b) $I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n})\to c_\Gamma$.

(c) $||u_{\lambda_n}||_{\lambda_n,\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'}\to 0$.

Therefore, from of Proposition 4.1, we derive that (u_{λ_n}) converges in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ to a function $u\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, which satisfies $u=0$ outside Ω and $u_{|_{\Omega_j}}\ne 0$, $j=1,\cdots,l$. Now, we claim that $u=0$ in Ω_j, for all $j\notin\Gamma$. Indeed, it is possible to prove that there is $\sigma_1>0$, which is independent of j, such that if v is a nontrivial solution of $(C)_{\infty,\Gamma}$, then

$$\|v\|_{H_0^1(\Omega_\Gamma)}\ge\sigma_1.$$

However, the solution u verifies

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega_\Gamma)} = 0,$$

showing that $u = 0$ in Ω_j, for all $j \notin \Gamma$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS The authors would like to thank the anonymous referee for his/her useful comments and suggestions which help to improve and clarify the paper greatly.

References

[1] C.O. Alves, Existence of multi-bump solutions for a class of quasilinear problems, *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* **6**(2006),491–509 .

[2] C.O. Alves & A.B. Nóbrega, Existence of multi-bump solutions for a class of elliptic problems involving the biharmonic operator, arXiv:1602.03112v1

[3] N. Ackermann, *On a periodic Schrödinger equation with nonlocal superlinear part*, Math. Z., **248**(2004), 423–443.

[4] T.Bartsch & Z.Q. Wang, *Existence and multiplicity results for some superlinear elliptic problems on* $\mathbb{R}^N$*,* Comm. Part. Diff. Equ. **20**(1995) 1725–1741.

[5] T.Bartsch & Z.Q. Wang, *Multiple positive solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger equations,* Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **51**(2000) 366–384.

[6] T. Bartsch, A. Pankov & Z. Q. Wang, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations with steep potential well,* Commun. Contemp. Math. **3**, (2001), 549–569.

[7] H. Berestycki & P.L. Lions, *Nonlinear scalar field equations, I Existence of a ground state,* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **82**(1983),313–346.

[8] B. Buffoni, L. Jeanjean & C.A. Stuart, *Existence of a nontrivial solution to a strongly indefinite semilinear equation*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **119**(1993), 179–186.

[9] V. Coti Zelati & R. Rabinowitz, *Homoclinic type solutions for semilinear elliptic PDE on* $\mathbb{R}^N$, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math. LV (1992), 1217–1269.

[10] M. Clapp & Y.H. Ding, *Minimal nodal solutions of a Schrödinger equation with critical nonlinearity and symmetric potential,* Diff. Int. Equa. **16**(2003), 981–992

[11] M. Clapp & D. Salazar, *Positive and sign changing solutions to a nonlinear Choquard equation,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **407** (2013), 1–15.

[12] S. Cingolani, M. Clapp & S. Secchi, *Multiple solutions to a magnetic nonlinear Choquard equation*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., **63** (2012), 233–248.

[13] M. del Pino & P. Felmer, *Multipeak bound states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **15**(1998), 127–149.

[14] M. del Pino & P. Felmer, *Local Mountain Pass for semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **4**(1996), 121–137.

[15] Y. Ding & K. Tanaka, *Multiplicity of positive solutions of a nonlinear Schrödinger equation,* Manus. Math., **112**, (2003), 109–135.

[16] Y. Ding & A. Szulkin, *Bound states for semilinear Schrödinger equations with sign-changing potential,* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **29**, (2007), 397–419.

[17] A. Floer & A. Weinstein, *Nonspreading wave pachets for the packets for the cubic Schrödinger with a bounded potential*, J. Funct. Anal., **69**(1986), 397–408.

[18] M. Ghimenti & J. Van Schaftingen, *Nodal solutions for the Choquard equation*, arXiv:1503.06031v1

[19] M. Ghimenti, V. Moroz & J. Van Schaftingen, *Least Action nodal solutions for ghe quadratic Choquard equation*, arXiv:1511.04779v1

[20] E. H. Lieb, *Existence and uniqueness of the minimizing solution of Choquard's nonlinear equation*, Studies in Appl. Math., **57**(1976/77), 93–105.

[21] E. Lieb & M. Loss, "Analysis," *Gradute Studies in Mathematics*, AMS, Providence, Rhode island, 2001.

[22] P.L. Lions, *The Choquard equation and related questions*, Nonlinear Anal., **4**(1980), 1063–1072.

[23] G.B. Li. Some properties of weak solutions of nonlinear scalar field equations, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 14 (1989), 27-36.

[24] C. Miranda, Un' osservazione su un teorema di Brouwer, Bol. Un. Mat. Ital., 3 (1940) 5–7.

[25] L. Ma & L. Zhao, *Classification of positive solitary solutions of the nonlinear Choquard equation*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **195**(2010), 455–467.

[26] V. Moroz & J. Van Schaftingen, *Ground states of nonlinear Choquard equations: Existence, qualitative properties and decay asymptotics*, J. Funct. Anal., **265**(2013), 153–184.

[27] V. Moroz & J. Van Schaftingen, *Existence of groundstates for a class of nonlinear Choquard equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-2014-06289-2

[28] V. Moroz & J. Van Schaftingen, *Semi-classical states for the Choquard equation*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **52** (2015), 199–235.

[29] V. Moroz & J. Van Schaftingen, *Groundstates of nonlinear Choquard equations: Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev critical exponent*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **17** (2015), no. 5, 1550005, 12 pp.

[30] S. Pekar, *Untersuchungüber die Elektronentheorie der Kristalle*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1954.

[31] R. Penrose, *On gravity's role in quantum state reduction,* Gen. Relativ. Gravitat., **28**(1996) , 581–600.

[32] C.A. Stuart & H.S. Zhou, *Global branch of solutions for non-linear Schrödinger equations with deepening potential well,* Proc. London Math. Soc. **92**(2006), 655–681.

[33] Y. Sato & K. Tanaka, *Sign-changing multi-bump solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with steep potential wells,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **361**(2009), 6205–6253.

[34] S. Secchi, *A note on Schrödinger-Newton systems with decaying electric potential*, Nonlinear Anal., **72** (2010), 3842–3856.

[35] E. Séré, *Existence of infinitely many homoclinic orbits in Hamiltonian systems,* Math. Z. **209**(1992), 27–42.

[36] Z.P. Wang & H.S. Zhou, *Positive solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with deepening potential well.* J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **11** (2009), 545–573.

[37] J. Wei & M. Winter, *Strongly Interacting Bumps for the Schrödinger-Newton Equations*, J. Math. Phys., **50**(2009), 012905.

[38] M. Willem, Minimax Theorems, Birkhäuser, 1996.